

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 19-32, of which claims 1, 14 and 27 are independent claims, are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-2, 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. 5,446,529 to Stettner et al. Claims 3, 10-17 and 19-32 stand rejected under Stettner in view of U.S. 5,015,868 to Park. Applicants respectfully traverse.

In rejecting claims 1-2 and 4-9 the examiner submits that "the Stettner reference discloses in Figures 1-5 and 9 a semiconductor surface (CMOS image processes, sic, chip 7, See Col. 6 lines 1-5) comprising a plurality of light sensitive pixels (unit cells 10), wherein each pixel of said plurality of pixels comprises an electronic circuit formed on or in the surface....comprising: a photosensor (diode 41, See Col. 7, lines 38-41)...".

Unit cells 10 in Figs. 1-5 and 9 do not comprise a photosensor at all. The unit cells are sensitive to electrons produced in a photocathode formed on the vacuum side 82 of entrance window 8 (col 5 lines 59-60, Figs. 2-4) and amplified by a microchannel plate 6 before they reach cells 10. Alternatively, the cells are sensitive to electrons produced by photodiodes 41 that are mounted in a diode array chip 40 and connected to the unit cells by indium bumps 42 (Fig. 9 col 7 lines 33-40). Nowhere in the patent are the unit cells 10 described as comprising a photosensor.

Applicants therefore submit that Stettner does not support a prima facie case of anticipation of claim 1 and that the claim is patentable over Stettner.

Stettner and Park do not support a prima facie case of obviousness against independent claim 14 and the claim is patentable over the combination because, in contradiction to the Examiner's contention, Stettner does not disclose all the subject matter recited by claim 1, as the applicants have noted above.


With regard to independent claim 27, neither Stettner nor Park, nor their combination, provides a semiconductor surface "having light sensitive pixels, each of which provides an output signal responsive to light thereon only while illuminated with the light". The Stettner and Park combination cannot therefore support a prima facie case of obviousness against claim 27 and the claim is patentable over the combination.

Dependent claims in the claim set are patentable either through their dependence on independent claim 1, 14 or 27 and/or because of patentable material that they contain.

001/02171 A02

In view of the above, applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable and respectfully request an allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
Ori J. BRAUN, et al.


Allan C. ENTIS
Reg. No. 52,866

September 16, 2005

William H. Dippert, Esq.
Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen LLP
250 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10177

Tel: 212-986-1116